REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action having a mailing date of March 11, 2005. Claims 1-12 are pending in the present Application. Applicant has amended claims 1-6. Consequently, claims 1-12 remain pending in the present Application.

This Application is under Final Rejection. Applicant has presented arguments hereinbelow that Applicant believes should render the claims allowable. In the event, however, that the Examiner is not persuaded by Applicant's arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the Amendment to clarify issues upon appeal.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 6 to remove the limitation introduced in the previous response. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment does not alter the scope of claims 1 and 6, does not introduce new matter, and does not require a new search. Applicant has also amended claim 1 to harmonize claim 1 with claim 6. Thus, claim 1 recites that an identity of the boot source is written. Applicant also notes that claims 3 and 4 already recited writing the identity of the boot source to various registers. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added and that no new search is required. Applicant has amended claims 2 and 5 to correct minor errors. Applicant has amended claims 3 and 4 to harmonize these claims with claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments to claims 2-5 do not introduce new matter and do not require a new search.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,678,833 (Grawrock). The Examiner also rejected claims 2, 3, 5, 10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Grawrock in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,944,821 (Angelo). The Examiner also rejected claim 8

under 35 U.S.C. § 103 under Grawrock in further view of "VIA's New South Bridge: VT82C686B

Supporting UltraATA/100" (Schmid) and "Intel Pentium III i815e Motherboard Shootout" (Sethi).

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 11

under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Grawrock. In so doing, the Examiner cited

Grawrock, col. 3, lines 62-67 and col. 4 lines 10-18 and 25-30. The Examiner particularly cited col.

4, lines 25-30 as describing writing an identity of a trusted boot source.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claim 1 recites a method for

evaluating a boot source in a computer system having a processor. The method recited in claim 1

includes determining the boot source used by the processor each time the computer system boots

and allowing the boot source to be specified once as a known boot source. The determination of

the boot source includes writing an identity of the boot source. Claim 6 recites an analogous

system claim in which the identity of the boot source is written to a register.

Thus, the method and system recited in claims 1 and 6 provides a trusted boot source.

Moreover, the method and system recited in claims 1 and 6 allow the trusted boot source to be

verified. In particular, the identity of the boot source, for example a location of the boot source, is

stored. Specification, page 8, lines 12-13. Thus, the source, or location, of the instructions that are

actually executed can be provided and independently verified. Specification, page 8, lines 13-15.

Consequently, a trusted boot source can be reliably provided. Specification, page 8, lines 15-16.

Grawrock fails to teach or suggest the method and system recited in claims 1 and 6,

respectively. In particular, Grawrock fails to teach or suggest writing an identity of the boot source

to a register or any other location. Grawrock describes a system which provides a boot block

identifier from the boot block memory unit, either the first time the computer system starts up or

each time the system starts up. Grawrock, col. 3, lines 57-67. However, the boot block identifier of

Grawrock is not an identity of the boot source. The boot block identifier of Grawrock is not, therefore, used to identify the source of the instructions and does not enable the source of the instructions to be verified. Instead, Grawrock specifically describes production of the boot block identifier as being a hash of "boot information." Grawrock, col. 3, lines 57-61. Grawrock further states that the "boot information" is basically an image or series of sub-images that collectively represent the boot block code. Grawrock, col. 3, lines 45-50. Thus, the boot information corresponds to the boot code itself rather than an identity of the boot source. Because the boot block identifier of Grawrock is a hash of the boot information, the boot block identifier of Grawrock merely corresponds to the contents of (instructions in) the boot source. The boot block identifier of Grawrock does not correspond to the identity of the boot source, but merely corresponds to the boot code. Grawrock thus fails to teach or suggest the recited writing of the boot block identity. Thus, Grawrock fails to tech or suggest a method and system recited in claims 1 and 6. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 7 are allowable as presented.

Clams 4 and claims 7, 9, and 11 depend upon independent claims 1 and 6, respectively. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claims 4, 7, 9, and 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4, 7, 8, and 11 are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner also rejected claims 2, 3, 5, 10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Grawrock in view of Angelo.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claims 2, 3, and 5 and claims 10 and 12 depend upon independent claims 1 and 6, respectively. Consequently, the arguments of Grawrock with respect to claims 1 and 6 apply with full force to claims 2, 3, 5, 10, and 12. As discussed above, Grawrock fails to teach or suggest a method or system that writes the identity of the boot block.

7

Angelo fails to remedy the defects of Grawrock. Angelo describes a system for secure registration and assessment of software and, therefore, does describe hashing. However, Applicant has found no mention in Angelo of writing the identity of the boot block, for example to a register. Consequently, combination of Grawrock and Angelo would also fail to teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 3, 5, 10, and 12 are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner also rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 under Grawrock in further view of Schmid and Sethi.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claim 8 depends upon independent claim 6. Consequently, the arguments of Grawrock apply with full force to claim 8. As discussed above, Grawrock fails to teach or suggest a method or system that writes the identity of the boot block.

Schmid and Sethi fail to remedy the defects of Grawrock. Schmid and Sethi describe a south bridge. However, Applicant has found no mention in Schmid or Sethi of writing the identity a boot source using the source of a particular number of instructions first executed. Consequently, any combination of Grawrock and Schmid and/or Sethi would also fail to teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicant's attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

__May 17, 2005__
Date

/Janyce R. Mitchell/ Reg. No. 40,095
Janyce R. Mitchell
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(650) 493-4540